



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/690,366	10/16/2000	Billy P. Taylor	1005.6	3106
53953	7590	09/03/2008	EXAMINER	
DAVIS LAW GROUP, P.C.			LUDWIG, MATTHEW J	
6836 BEE CAVES ROAD				
SUITE 220			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
AUSTIN, TX 78746			2178	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/03/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/690,366	TAYLOR, BILLY P.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MATTHEW J. LUDWIG	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-7,9-12 and 14-30 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-7,9-12 and 14-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment received 5/27/2008.
2. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, and 14-30 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 6, 11, 19, 20, 24, 25, 29, and 30 are independent claims.
3. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14, 15, and 17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated over Ono et al., PG Pub. No. 2004/0162842, pursuant to applicant's argument.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. **Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ono et al., PG Pub. No. 2004/0162842.**

In reference to dependent claim 1, Ono teaches:

The abstract processing section analyzes a computerized document stored in the document storage section to extract character strings before and after a keyword to create an abstract document represented by KWIC and copies and modifies the original document to embed a HTML tag at a location where the keyword occurs within the text so that keyword part within the document can be perceived. The keyword provides a proficient example of a reference to a second location and is not a computer network address. See page 4, [0074] through [0079], figure 7, and page 5, [0111 – 0114].

Furthermore, embedding a hyperlink is taught by the Omo reference with the HTML tag that is embedded within the keyword/detected reference.

Finally, as illustrated in figure 7, the KWIK representation teaches a means of highlighting the keyword for selection and also suggests the link being created in both the KWIC representation and the full text document (compare to *“while the first location is displayed on the display device, highlighting the first location to indicate the hyperlink as being selectable by a user to cause an operation associated with the second location”*). See page 4, [0074] through [0079] and figure 7.

In reference to dependent claim 2, Ono teaches:

Stretching the link by embedding a specific tag corresponding to the both documents of the abstract document and the KWIC document so that an appropriate location within the original document can be quickly referred from each KWIC representation in the abstract document. See page 4, [0074].

In reference to dependent claim 4, Ono teaches:

Stretching the link by embedding a specific tag corresponding to the both documents of the abstract document and the KWIC document so that an appropriate location within the original document can be quickly referred from each KWIC representation in the abstract document. See page 4, [0074]. The abstract document would provide a sufficient suggestion of a document external to the KWIK representation.

In reference to dependent claim 5, Ono teaches:

A Web document ranked in the retrieved result downloaded from each site. The downloaded Web document is held in the document storage section. The abstract creating system creates an abstract of each document by utilizing the keyword held in the keyword holding section by the method. The abstract creating system generates a KWIC document for KWIC representation. Then, the abstracts created per each document are collected into one abstract document. See page 8, [0174 –0178].

In reference to independent claim 6, Ono teaches:

A web document ranked in the retrieved result is downloaded from each site. The downloaded web document is held in the document storage section (compare to “storing a version of a paper, the version being displaying on a display device as a likeness of the paper”). See page 8, [0174 – 0178].

The abstract processing section analyzes a computerized document stored in the document storage section to extract character strings before and after a keyword to create an abstract document represented by KWIC and copies and modifies the original document to embed a HTML tag at a location where the keyword occurs within the text so that keyword part

within the document can be perceived. The keyword provides a proficient example of a reference to a second location and is not a computer network address. See page 4, [0074] through [0079], figure 7, and page 5, [0111 – 0114].

Furthermore, embedding a hyperlink is taught by the Omo reference with the HTML tag that is embedded within the keyword/detected reference.

Finally, as illustrated in figure 7, the KWIK representation teaches a means of highlighting the keyword for selection and also suggests the link being created in both the KWIC representation and the full text document (compare to *“while the first location is displayed on the display device, highlighting the first location to indicate the hyperlink as being selectable by a user to cause an operation associated with the second location”*). See page 4, [0074] through [0079] and figure 7.

In reference to dependent claim 7, Ono teaches:

Stretching the link by embedding a specific tag corresponding to the both documents of the abstract document and the KWIC document so that an appropriate location within the original document can be quickly referred from each KWIC representation in the abstract document. See page 4, [0074].

In reference to dependent claim 9, Ono teaches:

Stretching the link by embedding a specific tag corresponding to the both documents of the abstract document and the KWIC document so that an appropriate location within the original document can be quickly referred from each KWIC representation in the abstract document. See page 4, [0074]. The abstract document would provide a sufficient suggestion of a document external to the KWIK representation.

In reference to dependent claim 10, Ono teaches:

A Web document ranked in the retrieved result downloaded from each site. The downloaded Web document is held in the document storage section. The abstract creating system creates an abstract of each document by utilizing the keyword held in the keyword holding section by the method. The abstract creating system generates a KWIC document for KWIC representation. Then, the abstracts created per each document are collected into one abstract document. See page 8, [0174 –0178].

In reference to claims 11, 12, 14, 15, the limitations recite similar language to that of rejected claims numbered 1, 2, 4, and 5 respectively. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

In reference to dependent claim 17, Ono teaches:

The reference detected by Ono is text which provides a proficient example of the makeup of an address of a website associated with an advertisement. See page 8, [0174 – 0178].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 16 and 18-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ono et al., Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0162842 filed 2/23/2004.**

In reference to dependent claim 16 and 18, Ono teaches:

The abstract processing section analyzes a computerized document stored in the document storage section to extract character strings before and after a keyword to create an abstract document represented by KWIC and copies and modifies the original document to embed a HTML tag at a location where the keyword occurs within the text so that keyword part within the document can be perceived. The keyword provides a proficient example of a reference to a second location and is not a computer network address. See page 4, [0074] through [0079], figure 7, and page 5, [0111 – 0114]. Furthermore, embedding a hyperlink is taught by the Omo reference with the HTML tag that is embedded within the keyword/detected reference. Finally, as illustrated in figure 7, the KWIK representation teaches a means of highlighting the keyword for selection and also creates links in both the KWIC representation and the full text document. However the reference fails to explicitly state the second location is an advertisement within the version. Ono teaches web documents which include text, images, newspapers, etc and it is these documents which act as full text documents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the well-known newspapers taught by Ono which include advertisements, to specify advertisements within the newspapers of the full text document, because the text in newspapers/advertisements would have given a user methods for selecting and retrieving specific attributes of the full text newspaper/advertisement.

In reference to dependent claim 19, 20, and 23, Ono teaches:

The abstract processing section analyzes a computerized document stored in the document storage section to extract character strings before and after a keyword to create an abstract document represented by KWIC and copies and modifies the original document to

embed a HTML tag at a location where the keyword occurs within the text so that keyword part within the document can be perceived. The keyword provides a proficient example of a reference to a second location and is not a computer network address. See page 4, [0074] through [0079], figure 7, and page 5, [0111 – 0114].

Furthermore, embedding a hyperlink is taught by the Omo reference with the HTML tag that is embedded within the keyword/detected reference.

Finally, as illustrated in figure 7, the KWIK representation teaches a means of highlighting the keyword for selection and also suggests the link being created in both the KWIC representation and the full text document (compare to *“while the first location is displayed on the display device, highlighting the first location to indicate the hyperlink as being selectable by a user to cause an operation associated with the second location”*). See page 4, [0074] through [0079] and figure 7.

The reference provides for the full HTML document to come from both external web documents and internal web documents. The documents themselves include information pertaining to keywords provided by the user. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the well-known HTML link methods of Ono to provide access to different types of document content. The means of linking a user to specific types of content based upon keywords provides a user with detailed content and would have provided a framework for content to be text, audio signal information, or scripts, found on the World Wide Web.

In reference to dependent claim 21 and 22, Ono teaches:

The abstract processing section analyzes a computerized document stored in the document storage section to extract character strings before and after a keyword to create an abstract document represented by KWIC and copies and modifies the original document to embed a HTML tag at a location where the keyword occurs within the text so that keyword part within the document can be perceived. The keyword provides a proficient example of a reference to a second location and is not a computer network address. See page 4, [0074] through [0079], figure 7, and page 5, [0111 – 0114]. Furthermore, embedding a hyperlink is taught by the Omo reference with the HTML tag that is embedded within the keyword/detected reference. Finally, as illustrated in figure 7, the KWIK representation teaches a means of highlighting the keyword for selection and also suggests the link being created in both the KWIC representation and the full text document. However the reference fails to explicitly state the second location is an advertisement within the version. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the well-known HTML Web documents which represent text, images, books, newspapers, etc. to include a web document as an advertisement because it would have provided keywords for users interested in specific advertisement on the World Wide Web.

In reference to claims 24-30, the limitations recite similar language for performing reference detection and hyperlink selection as those presented in claims 19-23. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, and 14-30 have been considered but are not persuasive.

Applicant states on page 14 and 15 that Ono detects a keyword in a KWIC document but Ono embeds a clickable link within an abstract document (whose likeness is different from the KWIC document's likeness). Furthermore, applicant states that by embedding its clickable link within the abstract document (whose likeness is different from the KWIC document likeness), Ono clearly teaches away from claim 1, because Ono fails to embed its clickable link at the location where Ono detects the keyword in the KWIC document. The Examiner would like to point to the computerized document (version) found in figure 1. The document storage section holds a computerized document to be retrieved and to be abstracted. An abstract document and KWIC document are created from the original document or version. As presently claimed, the language states, 'at a first location within the version'. The KWIC and abstract documents are interpreted as locations within the version because both contain information extracted from the original version. The KWIC document provides a similar likeness to the original and embeds links within the version as well as a second location within the abstract document. The examiner proposes that the computerized document, the KWIC document, and the abstract document, are all displayable on a display device as a likeness of the paper. Without any further information related to the first location within the version or the second location, the examiner believes the reference to Ono provides sufficient language for a method of detecting keywords and creating documents with a likeness to the original with embedded links to allow a user access to various parts of the document.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Ludwig whose telephone number is 571-272-4127. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2178

ML